



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,442	06/26/2003	Dinesh G. Dutt	ANDIP031	7363
22434	7590	09/05/2007	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP			SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/609,442

Applicant(s)

DUTT ET AL.

Examiner

Robert C. Scheibel

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-18 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-18 and 20-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

- Examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's Amendment filed 6/19/2007.
- Claims 1, 7-9, 11-15, 22-24, and 26-29 are currently amended.
- Claims 1-2, 5-18, and 20-29 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see "Claim Objections" on page 8, filed 6/19/2007, with respect to the objections to the claims have been fully considered. Some of these arguments are persuasive as the objections have been corrected in the claims; however, some of these objections have not been addressed. The corrected objections have been withdrawn while the others are maintained herein.

2. Applicant's arguments, see "35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph" on page 8, filed 6/19/2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 9, 11, 14, 23, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered. Some of these arguments are persuasive as the claims have been appropriately corrected; however, some of these rejections have not been overcome in the claims. The corrected rejections have been withdrawn while the others are maintained herein.

3. Applicant's arguments, see "Double Patenting" on page 8, filed 6/19/2007, with respect to the provisional rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for double patenting have been fully considered and are persuasive. The provisional rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for double patenting has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2616

4. Applicant's arguments, see "The Art Rejection" on pages 8-9, filed 6/19/2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-11, 14-26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and claims 12-13 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

While the Applicant's invention as described in the specification can be distinguished from the system and apparatus of Czeiger, Examiner believes the present claim language does not sufficiently specify these differences. Examiner recommends that Applicant amend the claim language to better distinguish the present claims from Czeiger. (See the discussion of translation of IDs in paragraph 11 of page 4 of the present specification, for example.)

The first two paragraphs of the section entitled "The Art Rejection" summarize the independent claims and the Applicant's general belief that Czeiger does not anticipate these claims. In the next two paragraphs, Applicant summarizes portions of Czeiger, including Figure 2. Examiner agrees with the comment that element 96 in Figure 2 is also element 46 in the written description.

In the next two paragraphs, Applicant asserts that the two switches reside entirely within their respective SANs and thus do not disclose the limitation that the Border Switch is "part of both the first fabric and the second fabric". However, in the rejection, the combination of switches 26 and 46 anticipates the Border Switch of the claims. While in a preferred embodiment these are distinct switches residing completely in separate fabrics, this combination is also clearly supported in the written description of Czeiger. See lines 50-52 of column 6, for example, which indicates that the gateways are coupled to each other "by any means known in the art". Clearly one of these means is combining the two switches into one switch (or virtual switch) as indicated throughout with the combination of switches 27 into virtual switch 25 (or

Art Unit: 2616

switches 37 into virtual switch 45). Again, based on the broad claim language, this combined virtual switch clearly discloses the limitation that it is “part of both the first fabric and the second fabric” as some of the component parts of this combined switch belong to one fabric or the other.

As such, Examiner believes the rejections below to be valid and the present action is made Final. Again, Examiner strongly recommends amending the broad claim language to distinguish the present invention from Czeiger (as is done in the present specification).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase Domain_ID is not used consistently (see claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 24, and 29). In places it is “Domain ID” and in others it is “Domain_ID”. Please select one of these and change the other instances accordingly. The latter style is used throughout the specification.
- In claims 9 and 24, line 11, the phrase “the VSAN” doesn’t have antecedent basis in the claims. Examiner assumes Applicant intends the language “a VSAN” and requests the claim to be amended as such.
- In claim 26, line 5, the phrase “the name server” doesn’t have proper antecedent basis in the claims. Examiner assumes Applicant intends the language “a name server” and requests the claim to be amended as such.
- The acronym “RCSN” and “SW_RCSN” appears in several claims (such as 13 and 28) and should be similarly changed (to “RSCN” and “SW_RSCN”).

Art Unit: 2616

- In claim 23, line 5, the acronym FSPF should be defined as this is it's first use in the claim tree.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim **23** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim **23** recites the limitation "the adjacent fabrics" in lines 3 and 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This could be overcome by changing the limitation to "the fabrics" or indicating earlier in the claim tree that some or all of the fabrics are adjacent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2616

10. Claims **1-2, 5-11, 14-18, 20-26 and 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,985,490 to Czeiger et al.

Regarding claim **1**, Czeiger discloses an apparatus, comprising: a Switch (the combination of elements 26 and 96 in figure 2) configured to couple a first fabric (FC SAN A 22 of figure 2) having a first set of end devices (clients 24) and a second fabric (FC SAN B 42 of figure 2) having a second set of end devices (clients 44), each of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices having a unique Domain_ID address (the first byte of the address (see lines 23-28 of column 1) – corresponding to the virtual switch – this is also known as the Domain_ID in the art (such as the Fibre Channel standards)) respectively, the Switch configured to enable communication between the first set of end devices in the first fabric with the second set of end devices associated with the second fabric (discussed throughout; see abstract as well as lines 55-58 of column 2, for example) while maintaining the unique Domain ID addresses of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (also discussed throughout; see lines 63-64 of column 1 and lines 31-33 of column 2, for example).

Similarly, regarding claim **15**, Czeiger discloses an apparatus, comprising: a first fabric (FC SAN A 22 of figure 2); a second fabric (FC SAN B 42 of figure 2); a first set of end devices associated with the first fabric (clients 24) and a second set of end devices associated with the second fabric (clients 44), the first set and the second set of end devices each having a unique Domain ID address respectively (the first byte of the address (see lines 23-28 of column 1) – corresponding to the virtual switch – this is also known as the Domain_ID in the art (such as the Fibre Channel standards)); and a communication mechanism configured to enable the first set of end devices associated with the first fabric to communicate with the second set of end

Art Unit: 2616

devices associated with the second fabric (discussed throughout; see abstract as well as lines 55-58 of column 2, for example) while maintaining the unique Domain ID addresses of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (also discussed throughout; see lines 63-64 of column 1 and lines 31-33 of column 2, for example), wherein the first fabric and the second fabric are separate physical fabrics (FC SANS A and B of figure 2 as well as lines 56-59 of column 1), and the Switch is a Border Switch that is part of both the first fabric and the second fabric (see figure 2 which shows the switch (the combination of elements 26 and 96) as part of both fabrics), the Border Switch configured to inject frames of information between the first fabric and the second fabric to enable communication between members of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (discussed throughout; see abstract as well as lines 52-55 of column 7 and figure 5, for example), wherein the communication mechanism is a Border Switch that is part of both the first fabric and the second fabric (see figure 2 which shows the switch (the combination of elements 26 and 96) as part of both fabrics), the Border Switch configured to inject frames of information between the first fabric and the second fabric to enable communication between members of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (discussed throughout; see abstract as well as lines 52-55 of column 7 and figure 5, for example).

Regarding claims **2 and 17**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the first and second fabrics are first and second Virtual Storage Area Networks respectively in that the switches within each of SAN A and SAN B are combined into virtual switches (see figure 2 and lines 13-33 of column 2, for example).

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claim **18**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the first fabric and the second fabric are separate physical fabrics in FC SANS A and B of figure 2 as well as lines 56-59 of column 1.

Regarding claims **4 and 19**, Czeiger discloses the limitations that the Switch is a Border Switch that is part of both the first fabric and the second fabric (see figure 2 which shows the switch (the combination of elements 26 and 96) as part of both fabrics), the Border Switch configured to inject frames of information between the first fabric and the second fabric to enable communication between members of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (discussed throughout; see abstract as well as lines 52-55 of column 7 and figure 5, for example).

Regarding claims **5 and 20**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the first fabric and the second fabric are Edge fabrics and further comprising a Transit fabric configured to carry traffic between the first fabric and the second fabric in Figure 2. The Switch (the combination of elements 26 and 96) is clearly located at the edge of the SANs. Element 54 is a transit fabric which carries traffic between the two other fabrics (see lines 61-63 of column 3 as well).

Regarding claims **6 and 21**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the first fabric and the second fabric are adjacent to each other and the Switch is configured to directly switch traffic between end devices in the first and second fabrics in Figure 2 as well as Figure 5 which show how frames (traffic) are switched between end devices on each SAN.

Regarding claims **7 and 22**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the Border Switch is configured within an Inter-VSAN zone, the Inter-VSAN zone including members from the first set of end devices associated with the first fabric and the second set of end devices associated

Art Unit: 2616

with the second fabric. See figure 2, lines 15-22 of column 3, figure 4, and lines 10-41 of column 7. These figures and passages explain how to configure the Switch (by updating the translation tables) so that the end devices in FC SANs A and B so that they can communicate with each other; this set of end devices in the translation tables is interpreted as a zone and it clearly contains members from both fabrics.

Regarding claims **8 and 23**, Czeiger discloses the limitations that the Border Switch determines via the Inter-VSAN zone: (i) the content of a name server database that is exported from one of the adjacent fabrics to the other and vice versa (see lines 34-48 of column 2 and lines 28-32 of column 7; the passage in column 7 indicates that the virtual switch identification is part of the name server database content and the passage in column 2 indicates the decision of which of this content to export); (ii) the set of FSPF domains to export in Link State Update (LSU) messages (see lines 34-48 of column 2 which indicates that the LSR is exported to the compound network); (iii) the set of addresses to switch from one of the adjacent fabrics to the other and vice versa (the translation tables discussed throughout); and (iv) the set of adjacent fabrics to which Switch Register State Change Notifications (SW_RSCNs) received from a fabric are propagated and vice-versa (see lines 34-48 of column 2; the gateway determines which virtual switches and LSR information to be exported and clearly identifies where (which fabrics) to forward this information).

Regarding claims **9 and 24**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the Border Switch is configured to (v) rewrite the VSAN of a frame received from the first VSAN to the second VSAN if traffic is destined to the second VSAN in the second and third steps of figure 5.

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claims **10 and 25**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the Border Switch in the Inter-VSAN zone supports the definition and exchange of Inter-VSAN zones in figure 2, lines 15-22 of column 3, figure 4, and lines 10-41 of column 7. The updating of the translation tables defines the Inter-VSAN zones. The process by which the relevant information in these tables is passed to other fabrics (see lines 34-48 of column 2 for example) discloses the exchange of the Inter-VSAN zone.

Regarding claims **11 and 26**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the name server database in the Border Switch is configured to: (i) build the list of name server entries to be exported from a first fabric to the second fabric and vice-versa (see lines 34-48 of column 2 and lines 28-32 of column 7; the passage in column 7 indicates that the virtual switch identification is part of the name server database content and the passage in column 2 indicates the decision of which of this content to export).

Regarding claims **14 and 29**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the Switch enables communication between the end devices in the first fabric and the second fabric while maintaining the unique Domain_IDs of each of the first set and the second set of end devices by: (i) administratively partitioning the domain number space across the fabrics (the partitioning of the switch ids to each of the switches; see lines 23-30 of column 1 which indicates that the switch identifiers are administered to identify each switch); or (ii) associating a range of Domain-IDs to be used only for Inter-VSAN routing.

Regarding claim **16**, Czeiger discloses the limitation that the communication mechanism is a Switch configured to couple the first fabric and the second fabric, the Switch configured to enable communication between the first set of end devices in the first fabric with the second set

Art Unit: 2616

of end devices associated with the second fabric while maintaining the unique Domain ID addresses of the first set of end devices and the second set of end devices (the translation table (updated in Figure 4) enables communication between the first and second sets of end devices; as indicated above, the addresses of the end devices are not changed (see lines 63-64 of column 1 and lines 31-33 of column 2, for example)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims **12-13 and 27-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,985,490 to Czeiger et al in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0230787 to Blumenau et al.

Czeiger discloses all limitations of parent claims 11 and 26 as indicated in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) above. Czeiger does not disclose expressly the limitations of claims 12 and 27 of Switch Register State Change Notifications being generated across the fabrics when the name server database changes. Blumenau discloses sending an RSCN whenever the system configuration changes in paragraph 45 on page 6. Czeiger and Blumenau are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of Fibre Channel systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to update other switches in the system of configuration changes using RSCN messages as in Blumenau. The motivation for doing so would have been to dynamically keep the system updated of configuration changes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Blumenau with Czeiger for the benefit of dynamic configuration updates to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12 and 27.

Regarding claims **13 and 28**, Czeiger, modified, discloses the limitation that the Border Switch is further configured to prevent the replication of RCSNs in one of the following ways: (i) selecting a first Switch and a second Switch in the first or second fabric for distributing RCSNs in each fabric respectively; (ii) statically configuring the fabrics; or (iii) selecting a specified Switch to distribute the RCSNs (the switch which is the combination of elements 26 and 96 of figure 2 is selected to provide the configuration updates via it's gateway as indicated in lines 34-48 of column 2).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Scheibel whose telephone number is 571-272-3169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday from 6:30-5:00 Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RCS 8-30-07
Robert C. Scheibel
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2616

Wing F. Chan
8/30/07
WING CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER